

REMARKS

This Supplemental Amendment is filed to correct the lack of “the” before “target molecules” in claim 1 when the term “target molecules” is used subsequent to the first time. Also, the limitation “the target molecules comprising biological molecules” is fully supported by the disclosure in paragraph [0018] which discloses “target biomolecules.”

Also, the statement on page 7, last paragraph of the Amendment filed July 30, 2008, should read:

One of ordinary skill in the art would not look to replace the SAW DNA sensors of Ward or Oyama with the FBAR device of Yamada because Ward/Oyama and Yamada are in completely different fields and there no evidence that the substitution of the SAW DNA sensors of Ward or Oyama **with** Yamada’s FBAR device designed for mobile communications would still allow the SAW DNA sensors of Ward and Oyama to work for the intended purpose of nucleic probe assays (Ward) or detecting target DNA in a sample (Oyama).

Note that the word “into” has been changed to “with” in the above sentence.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: July 30, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Raj S. Dave/
Raj S. Dave

Registration No.: 42,465
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
1500 K Street, NW
Suite 250
Washington, DC 20005-1714
(202) 347-7865
(202) 347-7866 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Intel Corporation